

removal under” CAFA. *Id.* at \*1. However, the court had already rejected that exact argument and ruled that it had jurisdiction. *Id.* That previous order became the law of the case, and the Court denied remand. *Id.* at \*1-2. Applying that rationale supports remand here: the Court has already analyzed and determined whether it had jurisdiction, decided it did not, and decided that Plaintiffs could not amend and therefore there were no allegations Plaintiffs could make that met the CAFA standard. That is the law of the case, and Valve has not provided any additional evidence or information in its Notice of Removal as to the amount in controversy here that justifies relitigation of that issue now.

#### IV. AUTHORITY

The Court has authority for the requested remand order pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c).

#### V. CONCLUSION

This Court has already determined that there are no allegations Plaintiffs could make that would meet the amount in controversy requirements under CAFA, and Valve has not provided any additional information in the form of affidavits, profit/loss statements, revenue reports or other financial data showing how much money it made from its illegal gambling platform. In the absence of any additional evidence, Valve’s Notice of Removal is defective and this Court must remand this case to King County Superior Court so that Plaintiffs may move forward with their claims.

DATED this 29th day of December, 2016.

By: /s/ Kim D. Stephens

By: /s/ Jason T. Dennett

Kim D. Stephens, WSBA #11984

Email: [kstephens@tousley.com](mailto:kstephens@tousley.com)

Jason T. Dennett, WSBA #30686

Email: [jdennett@tousley.com](mailto:jdennett@tousley.com)

**TOUSLEY BRAIN STEPHENS PLLC**

1700 Seventh Avenue, Suite 2200

Seattle, WA 98101

Tel: (206) 682-5600

Fax: (206) 682-2992